

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3965

orado. The response to this poll has been most gratifying and I take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to all those Coloradans who participated in this grassroots expression of opinion and conviction.

Experts told me I could expect a 6- to 8-percent return. As of this time, 17,098 people returned questionnaires, answered all or in part. This is a return of almost 14 percent and demonstrates dramatically that the people of the Second District are aware of the problems that face the Nation and are vitally concerned over their solutions.

In addition to the over 17,000 questionnaires, I received over 3,500 individually written letters, supplementing the answers to the questions.

Mr. Speaker, once again I am impressed with the high honor it is to represent these dedicated people of a great district.

I am including at this point in my remarks the final tabulation of the results of the 1964 questionnaire for the Second District of Colorado:

RESPONSE TO BROTZMAN QUESTIONNAIRE

The complete results of the questionnaire are as follows:

1. Do you favor the United States selling wheat or other farm products to Communist nations?

Yes, 41.7 percent; no, 58.3 percent.

2. Should the United States undertake a more aggressive program to rid Cuba of Castro?

Yes, 77.8 percent; no, 22.2 percent.

3. Do you believe appropriations for foreign aid should be:

	Percent
(a) Reduced substantially.....	62.6
(b) Maintained at present level.....	32.4
(c) Increased.....	5.0

4. Should the U.S. Constitution be amended to allow voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools?

Yes, 57.3 percent; no, 42.7 percent.

5. Do you favor hospital and medical care for the elderly through:

	Percent
(a) Emphasis on Federal-State matching funds (Kerr-Mills).....	38
(b) Income tax credit to pay for voluntary insurance.....	41
(c) Hospital insurance, financed through increased social security tax (King-Anderson).....	21

6. Do you favor income tax credit for parents of students in college?

Yes, 78.8 percent; no, 21.2 percent.

Immigration Reform Urged by Church Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 29, 1964

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, President Lyndon Johnson, like former Presidents Truman and Eisenhower and the late President Kennedy, has called for modification and liberalization of our Nation's immigration policy and elimination of the highly discriminatory national origins quota system. I am one of the Senate sponsors of Senate bill

1932, which is sponsored by a bipartisan group of 27 Senators.

The United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., has recently published a most useful bulletin on the church's support for needed changes in our immigration laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the bulletin be published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHWIDE SUPPORT FOR IMMIGRATION

For years, church and civic leaders have favored the liberalizing of U.S. immigration policy. They have felt that the quota system based on national origin is out of harmony with U.S. foreign policy and is open to charges of racial and ethnic bias.

Long overdue and much-needed legislation to revise our inadequate and discriminatory immigration quota laws (the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952) was sent to Congress on July 23, 1963, by President John F. Kennedy. The bills—S. 1932, H.R. 7700—which are sponsored by 27 Senators and 53 Representatives, have now been strongly endorsed by President Lyndon B. Johnson. Energetic public support is needed to insure the passage of this important reform legislation.

The bills have been referred to the respective Senate and House Judiciary Committees. The Senate Immigration Subcommittee heard supporters of the legislation during 2 days of hearings, January 13 and 14, 1964. But there have been no further Senate hearings. However, hearings began in the House on June 11.

Senators PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, and KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, are leading Senate supporters; Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has been a leading House proponent of constructive changes.

The most dramatic feature of the proposed legislation is the elimination of the national origins quota system (based on the 1920 census) and the substitution of a quota pool which would be distributed on the basis of other criteria and priorities such as national interest, special skills, reunion of families, and resettlement of refugees. The bill eliminates discrimination against residents of the Asia-Pacific Triangle. It extends nonquota status to newly independent Western Hemisphere countries previously denied this privilege, that is, Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago.

The bill makes permanent provision for the entry of refugees by authorizing the President, after receiving recommendations from a seven-man immigration board also created under this legislation, to reserve up to 50 percent of the unallocated quota numbers for issuance to persons disadvantaged by the changes in the quota system and up to 20 percent to refugees whose sudden displacement requires special treatment. These persons, like all other immigrants, must meet rigorous health, morals, and security standards.

WHY IS NEW LEGISLATION NEEDED?

Under our present system:

Ireland, with a population of 2,824,000, has a larger immigration quota than all of Asia with its nearly 1½ billion inhabitants.

The quota for tiny Switzerland is greater than the combined quotas for the entire African Continent.

Countries in northwestern Europe are apportioned nearly 82 percent of the total quota, countries in southeastern Europe 16 percent, and the rest of the world only 2 percent.

While hundreds of thousands of persons wait for endlessly oversubscribed quota numbers, thousands of nontransferable places go unused each year in such undersubscribed countries as Great Britain and Germany.

These and other facts prompted President Kennedy in submitting the proposed legislation to Congress last July to say: "The use of a national origins system is without basis in either logic or reason. It neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose. In an age of interdependence among nations, such a system is an anachronism, for it discriminates among applicants for admission into the United States on the basis of accident of birth."

Note: This will not open the doors to a flood of immigrants. They will still need an affidavit of support for visa issuance. Preference is given to reunion of families and skilled workers.

OUR GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S STAND

In 1954, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America approved a deliverance calling for the radical amendment of the prevailing McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which contained several features that many church bodies regarded as discriminatory and objectionable.

The McCarran-Walter Act has been amended from time to time since it won congressional approval in 1952, but many of its most objectionable features (from the church's point of view) remain as the law of the land and the basis of our Nation's immigration policy. Every year legislation has been introduced in Congress to renovate completely our immigration laws, but none of these offerings has survived the legislative mill.

In the meanwhile, special legislation has been required in increasing volume to take care of urgent situations and cases not covered by the basic law. Since 1952 an average of about 250,000 persons have entered this country annually as immigrants, only 40 percent of them under quotas prescribed in the McCarran-Walter Act, the rest as exceptions or nonquota immigrants covered by special legislation.

There has been mounting pressure upon Congress and the administration from a great variety of voluntary groups interested in the matter to change the basic law to make it more realistic and contemporary and to purge it of the features which many people find discriminatory, inhumane, and contrary to our Nation's best interest.

The 175th general assembly in 1963 called upon United Presbyterians to encourage and support efforts to revise our Nation's present basic immigration laws to:

(a) Remove restrictive and discriminatory provisions against immigrants from eastern and southern Europe, against people from Asian countries, against persons from the sub-Saharan Africa, and against persons who are arbitrarily barred on the basis of race and national origin.

(b) Substitute a new formula for granting visas, which takes into account both the needs of the people seeking admission and the vital interests of our own people, in terms of national security and economic well-being.

(c) Update the basic law to conform with present needs and with actual practices since 1952, which means the admission of as many as 250,000 persons a year instead of 150,000 as under the present basic law.

(d) Provide that, if national and regional quotas are used in equalizing the admission of immigrants, they be based on the census of 1960 rather than on the census of 1920.

(e) Provide that unused quotas be pooled at the end of the year and reallocated to quota areas having a backlog of applications for admission to the United States.

(f) Provide for the admission of refugees in large-enough numbers to alleviate emergency situations which result in refugee communities requiring resettlement.

(g) Encourage the reunification of families by admitting blood relatives of recent immigrants on a nonquota basis.

A3966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 29

A Nation Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1964

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of July 17, 1964:

A NATION REBORN

(By James S. Copley)

The light has been turned on. We are going to witness a great struggle for the soul of America.

The Republican Party made that decision when it nominated Senator BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona for President and adopted a platform outspoken for constitutional government and individual freedom, and for the defeat of communism.

The Democratic Party will nominate Lyndon B. Johnson for President, and its platform will not be able to escape the tenets which have bound it to a philosophy of overpowering government, Federal paternalism, and fateful coexistence with communism.

The Republican Party has not really changed. Conservatives always have been the largest group within the party, even as they constitute a formidable but apprehensive body within the Democratic Party.

But a new and younger generation of conservatives, who were not wounded by the defeats of the 1930's, have taken command and there will be no more retreats from what at last must be faced.

They bring to the national stage a plea for a reaffirmation of the American faith.

Is this faith, as we have understood it, no longer tenable?

That, it seems to me, is the great issue that must underlie the debates that soon will be heard in every town and city of the United States.

Most people, Democrats no less than Republicans, believe themselves to be good Americans. And they are. But over the years there has been a rising drift away from constitutional government and both parties have been guilty of avoiding a direct confrontation on whether a time of deep change in America has arrived.

Is the system of government that we have known no longer capable of solving the problems of a modern complex society? Must government absorb the liberties and replace the initiative of its people?

There has been a lot of lip service given to free enterprise, but at the same time there has been a steady erosion of individual responsibility and a deepening penetration of Government into every phase of the people's lives.

In the choice of its leaders and provisions of its platform the Republican Party has told the American people it believes Government cannot be allowed to become their master and that it has a mandate to return the Nation to its historic purposes.

It can be done, as Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower told the convention, if Republicans themselves "cleave to the straight path of principle and commonsense" and find their strength in the unity that comes from a consensus broad enough to accommodate all who subscribe to the basic doctrines of the party and the Constitution.

The issue is not just domestic. It is worldwide. The ultimate surrender to Government is communism.

Is the acceptance of coexistence with communism, in the belief it is necessary in the

need to do everything possible to avoid a nuclear war, a loss of national will that abandons the cause of freemen around the world and will fatally corrupt our own way of life?

This question, too, must be answered. And the Republicans have chosen to answer it. We must restore our national strength and integrity. We must emerge victorious in the long struggle with atheistic communism or lose everything.

The lines have been drawn, the commanders designated and the forces rallied. There are no sidelines in such a struggle. It will be a compelling and enlightening campaign—and it could be a foreboding one.

But the courage of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is summoning millions of persons to the cause that must not be lost—the rebirth of Americanism in America.

Behind the Scenes With L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 29, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Behind the Scenes with L.B.J." The editorial was published in the Gazette Telegraph of Colorado Springs.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Colorado Springs (Colo.) Gazette Telegraph, June 30, 1964]

BEHIND THE SCENES WITH L.B.J.

The President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, says that 20 percent of the people in this country are impoverished. Any way you want to look at it, that means that 80 percent are not.

As a matter of fact, some of the recent maneuvers of the White House crowd have begun to create the impression that the 20-percent figure is something of a myth.

About a month ago, the President was touring about the country making political hay and stopping in lots of unlikely places on the spur of the moment.

One of these stops on May 7 last, was at Rocky Mount, N.C., where the Chief Executive called at the home of William David Marlow. The Marlows obviously were not enjoying a great deal of luxury and the show put on was pretty convincing.

Well, just the other day a reporter stopped back at the home of the Marlows to find out how they were doing and to get some comments. And he began to suspect that the "spur of the moment" visit had been rather well planned and staged in advance.

Mrs. Marlow proved talkative. "We didn't even feel like we were in poverty," she said. "We thought we were on our feet for the first time in 4 years. And along comes the word that we're the poorest folks in the country."

During the Presidential visit it was brought out that Mr. Marlow earned only \$1,500 per year.

Dr. George Smith, associate director of the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, had called on the Marlows before the presidential entourage came by.

Mrs. Marlow says of him that he "tried to make us look poorer than we are." She added that he "told me to be sure and have a washing on the line when the President

came and also be sure the children were barefoot when the President arrived."

When Dr. Smith was queried on this point, he denied that he had wanted the Marlows to look poorer than they were; only that they should act "natural" with the presidential party.

One thing seems certain at least, the "spur of the moment" visit had been prepared in advance. Another item that reporters have now brought out is this: Marlow denies that he makes only \$1,500 per year from farming. According to him, he expects to gross about \$4,000 this year, of which \$1,500 will be his net. But the conversation ensuing during the President's visit implied that the \$1,500 anticipated net was really the anticipated gross.

It is possible the President was actually engaged in fooling people into thinking there is a greater problem in respect to poverty than there really is. The evidence is beginning to come in that this is the case.

Of course there are people who are poor. This is not in question. But there is a growing question as to whether Mr. Johnson would know a poor person if he saw one.

If the President of the United States can't even find poor people, it seems a trifle naive to turn a great deal of money over to him so he can end their poverty. It begins to look as though these Johnson tours are simply following a script that may very well have been written by a television director.

Take Dr. George Smith, for instance. Dr. Smith works for the "Extension Service" which is the educational arm of the Department of Agriculture. It is the job of Dr. Smith and others similarly employed to help set the stage in agricultural areas so that Johnson's policies can be dramatized. Some refer to the "Extension Service" as the "political arm" of the administration. It appears to be charged with the task of creating a favorable setting for the Johnson program.

But if the Johnson program has to operate in front of stage props, there's a grave question as to the sincerity of any part of it.

Time was, when men spoke up from deep feelings and convictions. They may not have been impeccably groomed at the time, and they were disinterested in creating an "image." But they thought that what they said was important and it was important because it represented their deepest convictions.

Nowadays, almost everything is staged. Speeches are written by trained verbalists, cameras catch every detail and the overall impression is far more important than the real meaning and intent.

Which leaves us with the overall impression that the "war on poverty" is nothing but a phony and that the administration cares about votes more than it cares about the poor.

Transportation First for Peoria, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 29, 1964

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an experiment, never tried before in any part of the country, will begin August 1 in Peoria, Ill., in cooperation with the University of Illinois. An article by James A. McCormick in the July 26, 1964, issue of the Peoria Journal Star indicates the extent of the project. Under unanimous consent, I include the article at this point: